

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please amend Fig. 1 to include the legend --(Prior Art)--. A redlined copy of the drawing, as well as a Replacement Sheet incorporating the amendment are attached to this correspondence.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-20, 22-26, and 28 remain pending in the application. Applicant, by this paper, amends claims 1, 3, 10, 11, 12, 15, 20, 25, and 26. Applicant cancels claims 2, 21, and 27. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Discussion of Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to Fig. 1 as illustrating that which is old. Applicant amends Fig. 1 to include the legend --(Prior Art)-- as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings in light of the amendment to Fig. 1.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-8, 10-11, and 16-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over any one of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,201 to Feldtkeller (hereinafter Feldtkeller) or U.S. Patent No. 6,040,736 to Milanesi et al. (hereinafter Milanesi).

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Feldtkeller in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,189 to Perelle et al. (hereinafter Perelle).

Claims 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Feldtkeller in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,977,743 to Flock (hereinafter Flock).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference, or references when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Applicant cancels claims 2, 21, and 27, thereby rendering moot the rejection of those claims. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicant respectfully contends that the references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all claim limitations.

Claims 1, 20, and 26 include "a charge pump coupled to the headswitch, the charge pump selectively enabled based on a charge pump control signal, and operative to control the

headswitch based at least in part on the charge pump control signal." Support for the claim language can be found, for example, in Applicant's Specification at page 6, paragraph [1027]. None of the references cited by the Examiner teach nor suggest this claimed feature. None of the references teaches nor suggests a charge pump control signal that is used to selectively enable the charge pump. Thus, none of the cited references teaches nor suggest the charge pump controlling the headswitch based on the charge pump control signal. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 20, and 26, because the cited references, whether alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all claimed features.

Claims 3-20, 22-26, and 28 depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1, 20, or 26 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reason that they depend from an allowable base claim. Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 3-20, 22-26, and 28.

Discussion of Objections to the Claims

Claim 25 was objected to as missing text. Applicant amends claim 25 to clarify that it is the integrated circuit that "is fabricated with a complementary metal oxide semiconductor (CMOS) technology of 0.13 μm or smaller." Support for the amendment can be found in Applicant's Specification at page 14, paragraph [1059]. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 25.

Discussion of Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 15 was objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant amends claim 15 to include all of the features of the base claim and intervening claims. Applicant requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 15.

CONCLUSION

In light of the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the instant claims are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this Application is earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 18, 2005

By:



Howard Seo
Reg. No. 43,106
Attorney for the Applicants

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 845-5235
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502
Enclosures (2)